UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MAINE

IVAN M. SUZMAN,)
Plaintiff)
) Civil No. 05-192-P-S
V.)
ADOLPH CRISP, et al.,)
Defendants)

RECOMMENDED DECISION ON MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (DOCKET NO. 38) AND MOTION FOR DEFAULT (DOCKET NO. 39) BY IVAN SUZMAN

In his complaint Ivan Suzman relates that he has advanced Young-Onset Parkinson's Disease and complains of the defendants' fraud and deceit apropos their 'care' of him after he sought help in the wake of a personal crisis. Suzman has filed a motion for summary judgment (Docket 38) and a separate motion for default judgment, both against Defendant Adolph Crisp. (Docket No. 39.)

The motion for summary judgment states only that Crisp was served with a summons and a complaint on April 25, 2006, and failed to respond until June 2, 2006. The motion for default judgment relates the same information. In his own motion Crisp filed a motion to quash and to dismiss complaining that, while he received the amended complaint and exhibits from the United States Marshal he did not receive the actual summons. I have denied Crisp's motion to quash and recommended that the court deny Crisp's motion to dismiss. I have given all the defendants until September 1, 2006, to file

answers. I now **RECOMMEND** that the court **DENY** Suzman's motion for summary judgment and his motion for default judgment.

NOTICE

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within ten (10) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within ten (10) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

July 12, 2006.

/s/Margaret J. Kravchuk U.S. Magistrate Judge